



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,971	03/19/2001	Warren Edward Baxley	7257/80	9998
7:	590 06/28/2004		EXAMINER .	
TERRIL G. LEWIS		LIN, WEN TAI		
WONG CABELLO, LLP				
20333 S.H. 249			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 600			2154	12
HOUSTON, T	X 77070	•	•	· 🗘 🔻
•			DATE MAILED: '96/28/200)4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

R

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/812,971	BAXLEY ET AL.	h				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addre	!ss				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ply within the statutory minimum of the limit will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC te, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. INTHS from the mailing date of this comm ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 f							
,—	s action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) 20-23 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6,9,11-14 and 19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5,7,8,10 and 15-18 is/are objected to 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2001 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	awn from consideration. b. c. or election requirement. er. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ oludine edition of the content of the con	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	1.121(d).				
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-	152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in a prity documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	age				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.5-7.	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-15 	(2)				

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

2. Claims 20-23 are allowable because the prior art of record does not teach or

suggest individually or in combination a method for tuning the allocation of multipoint

control unit resources for multipoint network events such as video conferencing by

establishing a statistical, self-tuning model on the multipoint network events, wherein

predetermined tuning intervals are used to measure and normalize the actual utilization

of MCU resources in comparison with accumulated multipoint network events, and

determine a probability value for future use of MCU resources based on the measured

past events and their respective resource utilization.

3. Claim 19 is objected to because the term "the aforesaid multipoint network

event" appears to lack antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

•

Art Unit: 2154

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. Claims 1-4, 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyrud [WO 98/57485] in view of Official Notice.
- 6. Nyrud is cited from the IDS filed on 1/3/2003.
- 7. As to claim 1, Nyrud teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method for allocating MCU resources for a multipoint network event, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving an allocation request for the multipoint network event, said request at least associated with a number for the maximum MCU resources for the multipoint network event, determining the number of MCU resources to allocate at the start of the multipoint network event [page 6, line 36 - page 7, line 13].

Nyrud did not specifically teach that the start MCU resources allocation number is less than or equal in value than the maximum MCU resources number.

However, Official Notice is taken that it is a well-known practice not to assign resource amount more than what is being requested. Therefore, it is obvious to maintain such a practice in Nyrud's system because an over-booked system tends to spend additional time resolving resource conflicts and would thus substantially degrade the system performance and efficiency.

Art Unit: 2154

8. As to claims 2-4, Nyrud further taught that the step of receiving the allocation request originates in the plurality of MCUs, a common channel signaling interface, or as an external allocation request [Fig.1; page 10, lines 12 - 29; page 2, line 31 - page 3, line 6; that is, requests could come from any entity of the LAN across the WAN as a

- 9. As to claims 9 and 11-13, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4 above.
- 10. Claims 6, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyrud [WO 98/57485], as applied to claims 1-4, 9 and 11-13 above, further in view of Yang et al.(hereafter "Yang")[U.S. Pat. No. 6192243].
- 11. Yang is cited from the IDS filed on 6/10/2002.

direct call or Internet connection into a specific MCU].

12. As to claim 6, Nyrud teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method for dynamical allocation of MCU resources during a multipoint network event [page 5, lines 24-26], said method comprising the steps of determining the number of MCU resources to allocate for the start of the multipoint network event [page 6, line 36 - page 7, line 13].

Application/Control Number: 09/812,971

Art Unit: 2154

Nyrud does not specifically teach a method for time varying allocation of MCU resources during a multipoint network event, wherein at each of a plurality of modeling intervals during the multipoint network event, adjusting the number of allocated MCU resources based on users actually in the multipoint network event.

Yang taught a method of adjusting the number of allocated resources as a time-varying event based on a plurality of modeling intervals [col.3, lines 35-55; col.8, line 41 - col.9, line 24].

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Nyrud and Yang, becasue Yang's time-varying modeling based on pre-selected time intervals would make Nyrud's resource allocation method dynamically reflecting the true usage of resources for the entire event.

- 13. As to claims 14 and 19, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 1-4, 6, 9 and 11-13, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4, 9 and 11-13 above.
- 14. Claims 5, 7-8, 10 and 15-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Page 5

Art Unit: 2154

Savage et al.

[U.S. PGPub 20010009014]; and

Baugher et al.

[U.S. Pat. No. 5819043].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

June 22, 2004

Wen Jan L.